

REMARKS

The undersigned apologizes for the incomplete or rather incorrect response of 11/19/05. When studying the case, it was noted that the reference 6,374,611 was assigned to the assignee of the present application and this piece of information remained in the mind of the undersigned also when responding to the double patenting objection.

In any case, claims 2 and 4 have been indicated by the Examiner to include allowable subject matter. With the amendment proposed herewith, the subject matter of claim 2 has been included in claim 1 and also in claim 5 and claim 2 has been canceled. Reconsideration of these claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 4 are now dependent on claim 1 and should be patentable together therewith.

Reconsideration of the dependent claims 3 and 4 is also requested.

It appears - upon a careful study of the applications - that the double patenting rejection no longer applies as the subject matter of claim 2 is now included in all the claims.

Allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, and 5 as amended is therefore solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Klaus J. Bach
Reg. No. 26832
Cust. No.: 27956